



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

STUDIES IN POLITICAL AREAS.¹

THE POLITICAL TERRITORY IN RELATION TO EARTH AND CONTINENT.

ALTHOUGH only the one-fourth of the earth's surface which remains after allowance is made for the polar regions and the sea is habitable and politically occupied, nevertheless all the superficial areas of political geography stand to the earth's surface in the relation of parts to the whole. Just as the different races are members of the one human family, so countries are parts of this maximum political area out of which they have been formed in increasing size and number, as from one widely distributed element, and from which their growth is nourished. Karl Ritter's expression, "The Principle of Proportions," means in its deepest sense the spacial relation of every geographic phenomenon to the earth as a whole. In political geography this relation assumes a practical aspect, for all political extensions of territory have had to stop at the limits of the total space and definite regions found established on the earth.

The close connection between every country and the whole earth's surface exists not merely in the abstract, but it lives and operates in the present and all the future. This community of foundation determines the forms of contact and the mutual relations of these lands, so that, in spite of all differences and boundaries, they are never to be thought of as quite isolated existences. Herein lies one great cause of the progress of humanity, that, as more states and larger states grow up, the nearer do they edge together, and so much the more intimately must they act and react upon one another; history, therefore, means mutual approach and compression. From the time of Hanno and Pytheas, as the known earth has grown at the cost

¹ Translated by MISS ELLEN C. SEMPLE.

of the unknown, political territories have continually increased in size and number, one unknown region after the other taking on political value. In the same way, lands to which we are still strangers will gain political importance, till the whole earth has become familiar and capable of being turned to political account. In Africa, even during the last years, we have seen discovery and political possession going hand in hand; and we have witnessed how the efforts to reach the North and South Pole, on the part of all those nations participating therein, have assumed the character of national enterprises to gain ideal benefits of political value.

The conception of spacial relations on the part of historians is without doubt vitiated by the fact that these relations are expressed in terms which obscure the nature of the thing. When one speaks of "the dominating territorial position" of a nation, he means the large area which serves as its base. The word "territorial" does not describe the nature of the matter, but only the phenomenon; it is an expression of secondary importance. In the phrase "conditions of power," there lurks, as a rule, the idea of superficial extent; and particularly is this the case in Droysen's favorite expression, "ponderance of powers" (*Ponderation der Mächte*), since here is meant classification according to relative strength, and in this, of course, superficial extent must always play its great rôle. In all such inaccurate terms no adequate expression is found for the historical principle, that all events having to do with territorial changes possess an altogether special importance. When Mommsen (chap. iii., Book 5) calls the Roman conquest of Gaul an event "whose results even today determine the history of the world," he put into words the never-failing tendency of territorial changes to make their influence felt for a long time afterward. Political geography cannot, in the long run, be contented with this merely superficial consideration of a phenomenon so fundamentally geographical, but it must regard a systematic treatment of the same as one of its most important tasks.

The given space of every age has decided how far countries

have had to expand in order to become in reality "world powers," *i. e.*, to span the earth; and in this general process, every single country, even the smallest, has had its position continually modified by the growth of the whole. Since the size of the earth's surface sets limits to this development, the zenith can be reached by only a few states at the same time. In like manner, the number of the smaller powers naturally depends upon the fifty-one million square miles which stand at the disposal of all. In this space there would, indeed, be room for two hundred countries the size of Germany or France; but this wide expanse immediately shrinks when the five really great states of our time,—England, Russia, China, the United States and Brazil, take their share in it, for these occupy almost the half. What remains is still large enough for quiescent possession which has been historically established, but small for the far-reaching plans of a new Alexander or Napoleon. The whole earth suffices for only a few great political exploits, and this so much the more, since it not only restricts the political areas, but also curbs the incentives to activity and growth. Russia cannot expand without clashing with the British or Chinese Empire. We ourselves have seen how, scarcely had Germany modestly enough entered the ranks of the colonial powers, but forthwith a sense of crowding went through the world, and the still undivided territory in a short time was taken up. Only upon a small planet like this could a surface of two million square miles form the base of a "genuine" great state. Therefore one nation pushes the other out of its position as a world-power. What England is today, Spain was formerly, just as in that narrow horizon upon which the western world had not yet risen, the *Imperium Romanum* and the Persian Empire under Darius could not have existed side by side. In fact the succession in office, so to speak, of the "world-ruling" powers belongs to the most characteristic feature of ancient history. It is a phenomenon growing simply out of the question of space. In every age, however, we can call only that power a world-power which is strongly represented in all parts of the known earth, and espe-

cially at all critical points, by its own possessions. Even today only the British Empire can be designated as such. World-wide scattered interests constitute no position as a world-power; these can be maintained through commerce by small states like Belgium and Switzerland. Even a land-mass such as that of Russia would only grow to a world-empire through broader expansion on the Pacific and a corresponding position on the Atlantic; since only the oceans open to her an avenue for the possible extension of her sway over the lands of the western and southern hemispheres. When mention is made in historical works of the world-power of Rome, of the world-empire of Darius, of the world-position of the German Empire in the Middle Ages, and of many other world-ruling phenomena, a justification for such expressions can be sought only in the limited horizon of the times to which they refer. In our age they are merely hyperbolic and must rapidly become antiquated in the face of the great size of real world-powers.

In the idea world-power, there lurks an exaggeration which can be readily discerned. In view of the existing divisions of races and the form of our present political institutions and conditions, the expansion of a single government over the whole habitable earth is unthinkable. A universal state with 1500 million "citizens of the world" belongs to the realm of poetry. And nevertheless, the effort to banish the idea of cosmopolitanism out of practical politics as a useless chimera has failed utterly. Even a hundred years ago, the intellectual community of the civilized and literary peoples of Europe evidenced the fact that the boundaries of its own land had grown too narrow for every separate nation, and those of the continent, too contracted for all. The literature of world-wide circulation and the intellectual cosmopolitanism, which then grew to be a reality, could not possibly remain without exerting a retro-active influence politically. The idea of natural rights, the movement against the slave-trade and even against slavery, then so deeply rooted in most non-European lands, the considerate policy towards the natives on the part of the great colonial power England,—all had their origin

in a truly cosmopolitan humanitarian feeling, peculiar to all civilized peoples of the present time. In this sense, we find Karl Peters speaking of a "common European conscience" which at the end of the nineteenth century demands, on principle the recognition of the human rights of all belonging to the genus man. We find the expression quite apt, although we do not concede the justification of this particular verdict of the "common conscience." As to its world-wide validity, no one can doubt; even the adjective European is properly too restrictive. This, however, is only one drop from the stream of movements which are trying to sweep away the barriers to their universal acknowledgment,—an acknowledgment that shall extend over the inhabited earth. Our civilization and Christianity are striving after the broadest expansion, and as usual, commerce has already outstripped them in attaining it. The most obvious cosmopolitanism is to be found in the fact that there is today no corner of the earth to which the ideas and material products of occidental civilization do not penetrate. Political geography has its current set along a special course in this same direction. Every form of geographical consideration of a question tries to get an all-embracing survey. This is the chief purpose of geographical study. The advantage of laying a geographical foundation for political views and judgments lies to great extent in the multiplicity of the phenomena which constitute its base. Just as there are principles of history which time imparts, so there are principles of geography which we seek and compare in space. In this way, there lies a corrective for the self-sufficient narrowness of the European point of view in a broad survey of the earth. With the whole world as a background, many things seem insignificant or accidental which, in the continent, appeared important. Economically, politically, and above all in point of civilization, Europe is not to be thought of apart from the other continents. The most flourishing communities in all other parts of the world are nothing more than offshoots of Europe. All the continents have long lain in the politico-geographical horizon of Europe, and now they are steadily rising higher.

Only the politically far-sighted understand their own times ; and just as positively, therefore, should it be demanded of the political as of the physical geographer, that he be familiar with the whole earth. This is the cosmopolitanism that geographical study is meant to promote.

The unequal distribution of land among the continents determines the unequal distribution of political areas. Since Asia is nearly five times as big as Europe, the Americas four times, and Africa three times its size, the non-European world stands in contrast to the European as more spacious, applying therefore a larger standard of measure in questions of territory, making greater demands. Europe and Australia, which include respectively only 7.2 per cent. and 6.6 per cent. of all the land of the earth, offer each merely room enough for a single, genuine great power. Australia belongs entirely to the British Empire, and the whole continent together with Tasmania and New Zealand are about to be converted into the commonwealth of Australia,—that is, the whole continent be made into one state, the first instance of the kind in history. Besides Russia, which occupies more than half of Europe, that continent has room for only a fairly large number of medium powers ; among these, the Scandinavian kingdom, which stands next to Russia in point of size, covers, however, only one-seventh of the area of Russia in Europe. The average size of the European states is about equal to that of Switzerland.

Europe has twenty-four independent states and three small dependencies—the Faroe Islands, Malta and Gibraltar—which hold somewhat the same relative position as colonies in foreign lands. Among these is only a single state of continental proportions ; it embraces 55 per cent. of Europe. Then follow seven states, varying from 293,848 square miles (Norway and Sweden) to 114,410 square miles (Italy), which are great states according to the European standard of size ; ten which are medium states according to the same standard, ranging from the 64,000 square miles of European Turkey proper, to the 11,373 square miles of Belgium ; and six small states, or nine including the small outlying dependencies. The natural causes of this distribution

of territory are readily explained by the fact that the largest European state belongs entirely to the broad eastern expanse of the continent, while Norway and Sweden, Spain, France, Great Britain, and Italy are clearly defined by the physical forms of central and western Europe.

Asia has nine nominally independent states, but only China, Persia, and Japan can be regarded as independent in the European sense of the term. These take up almost one-third of the continent. Then come the possessions of the seven European powers, Russia, England, Turkey, Holland, France, Spain and Portugal; but if we divide these holdings into the individual states which exist as colonial dependencies, we get for Asia a total of thirty-two separate colonial domains.^{*} Among these, Siberia, China, the Empire of India (without Socotera and the African provinces), and Russian Central Asia together with the Trans-Caspian, must all be regarded as states of continental proportions; they embrace 73 per cent. of the continent. In addition, independent Arabia, the Dutch Indies, Asiatic Turkey, and Persia, all of which are from four to five times the size of Germany, are to be looked upon as great states. Afghanistan, Siam, French Farther India, the Trans-Caucasus, Japan, and the Philippine Islands have territories from 215,000 to 115,000 square miles in area, and they are therefore to be compared in point of extent with the great states of Europe. If we draw the line of the medium states at Bhutan (circa 13,000 square miles), then all the nine smaller states, such as Samos, Cyprus, Bahrain, Hong Kong, Macao, and others, belong to foreign powers. Moreover, they show by their scattered peripheral position, how little they have to do with the Asiatic system of distribution of land. This system undoubtedly gets its stamp from the broad mass of northern and central Asia, where three-fifths of the continent fall to the share of two domains. India begins the list of Asiatic states of medium size; it is far ahead of the rest in point of importance, however, because, starting from a peninsula, it has sent a wedge deep into the body of the continent. Like it, the others also are found in the peninsulas, islands, and coast countries of western, southern and eastern Asia.

Australia has five colonies, which, together with Tasmania and New Zealand, regard themselves as one whole, and for years they have maintained the community of their interests by independent agreements.

^{*} The Pamir countries and the small districts east of Bhutan are here left out of consideration as no longer independent. All Arabia not under Turkish rule is taken as a whole.

Their union, encouraged by the mother country, has entered upon the stage of official preparation since the conference in Hobart Town in January 1895. The areas of the five continental colonies vary according to their historical age, just as was the case in North America. The most recent, West Australia, Queensland, and the North Territory, embrace almost three times the area of the three older ones. The small size of Victoria and New South Wales has a close connection with their position in the southeast, the only narrow and richly articulated portion of Australia; that of the other two divisions lies in their character as islands.

Africa is at present undergoing a process of political transposition which is involving almost all its territories, so that it is scarcely possible to give even an approximate figure for the size of a single one of these. Evident enough is the fact, however, that the seven largest areas all belong to non-African powers, and that the list of native territories begins with no larger country than Morocco, which can count merely as a medium state. The Congo State, rooted in the largest river-basin of Africa, is relatively the most defined of the greater territories, although the latest formed. The absence of a state in Africa of decidedly predominating extent is due to the division of the larger half of the continent among eight foreign powers, to the lack of a native great power after the manner of China, and moreover, to the want of all political possibilities in the desert, which takes up one-fourth of the continent and that in the part most advanced in political respects.

In the Western Hemisphere, where North, Central, and South America (exclusive of the polar regions) stand in the proportion of 52: 2: 46, an entirely different allotment of land rules in the north from that in the south; and Central America, too, together with the West Indies, presents a peculiar distribution of its territory. North America is practically divided between the United States and the Dominion of Canada. Mexico, which is less than one-fourth the size of the United States, comes in here as a country of essentially South American proportions. In the limited area of Central America, on the other hand, we find a piecemeal division such as occurs nowhere else but in Europe. It is split up into seven independent states and twelve different colonies. The largest of these, Guatemala (48,700 square miles) is smaller than the smallest South American state, Uruguay (69,000 square miles), and the average size scarcely exceeds that of the Duchy of Brunswick. Almost half (47 per cent.) of South America is taken up by Brazil,

which is situated in the broadest part of the continent and embraces the largest river basin of the world. In the remaining portion, we find the next group of states in point of size, varying from two to five times the area of Germany, from the 1,125,000 square miles of Argentine to the 294,000 square miles of Chili; so that only a tenth of the whole remains for the far smaller domains, which range from Ecuador's 116,000 square miles to French Guiana's 30,000 square miles.

Let us review the division of the continents with independent states according to the three classes usually adopted on the basis of size: continental states, with an area of 2,000,000 square miles and over; medium states, from 80,000 to 2,000,000 square miles; and small states.

	Continental	Medium	Small
Europe	1	7	16
Asia	3	8	5
Africa	—	15	4
The Americas	3	9	12
Australia	1	—	—
Oceania	—	—	—

If we leave out of consideration the continent of Africa, which is only in the initial stage of political development, in all the rest we find the states of continental size in the preponderance. Moreover, these show a much closer relationship in point of extent than do the medium and smaller states; for the latter utilize the given area in a more accidental manner, while the former fill it out to its natural boundaries,—that is, from sea to sea, and therefore stand in closer touch with their territory. Where the same fact holds for medium and smaller states, it is to be explained, not by the size, but by the shape of the continent; wherefore, the very smallest states and colonies—leaving out of consideration members of federations—are located without exception on islands or strips of coast. The conclusion to be drawn from these smaller and older stages of development would only become apparent if we could construct a table of areas existing *before* the evolution of the numerous large and medium states; such a table would show everywhere an unqualified preponderance of small and smallest states in North America, Australia, and Northern Asia, even excluding from the list all medium states. But the material, unfortunately, is lacking for the reconstruction of those conditions. Still, we know enough to be

able to state the general principle that tribes which have been left to themselves, like the Negroes in Africa, Indians, Malays, Australians, and the inhabitants of the polar regions, have, with few exceptions and those rapidly disappearing, formed no states which exceed the limits of the medium states; and that they live, as a rule, under petty political conditions. On the other hand, Africa is sure, within ten years, to present a different picture, in which continental proportions will have developed out of medium states. According to the figures, most of the states of continental extent are to be found in the largest continents; in this connection, however, it is significant for the advanced territorial development of states in all continents, that those of medium size are almost as numerous as small ones, while the latter appear in Europe and Asia today merely as residues not yet absorbed. Since we leave the growth of states for the time being quite out of the present consideration, from the connection between age and stage of territorial development, we can seize only upon the fact that all states of continental size are of recent formation. Even China has reached its present great extent only in the last centuries; while the smallest, like Monaco, San Marino, Andorra and the Hanse Towns are among the oldest states.

Stating the present division of political areas in terms of Europe, Russia in Asia and the Chinese Empire are each larger than Europe, both together are nearly three times as big; British Asia is almost exactly the size of European Russia. In Africa, the French, British, Portuguese and German possessions, together with the Congo State, occupy an area that exceeds that of Europe by more than nine hundred thousand square miles. The French holdings in Africa are even now five times, the German are three and one-half times, as large as their respective mother countries; the Congo State is almost eighty times as large as Belgium. In America, we find the United States, the British possessions, and Brazil each with an area hardly smaller than that of Europe. Fourteen to fifteen such countries as Germany or France could find room within the boundaries of the United States. The average size of the twenty-four countries and colonies of America is 623,220 square miles, or almost three times as big as the area of France or Germany, and almost forty times the average size of

the European states. In addition to the eighteen independent countries of the western continents, the American holdings, as at present divided, of the European powers form nineteen colonial territories or dependent states, and eleven of these are smaller than Hayti, the smallest free American country (11,100 square miles). The average size of these thirty-seven divisions is nevertheless 504,000 square miles.

In the history of Europe, the conclusions remain yet to be deduced as to the unavoidable reaction of non-European upon European spacial conditions. Like everything unfinished, this state of affairs has a disturbing effect, above all naturally in the case of those countries whose size has not been determined by nature itself. Europe pays for the superiority of its concentrated situation in the temperate zone, so favorable to civilization, with the disadvantage of its limited space. One can speak of general European evils which find their root in this cause. Even in the times of powerful expansion, in Europe nothing more than a fragmentary extension in smaller districts has ever been possible for the Europeans, since every current of migration has met a counter-current which split it up. For this reason the German expansion towards the east was a laborious advance, a forward struggle in certain regions and an enforced halt in others. The final result, therefore, is a dismembered situation, fertile in friction, as we see it in eastern Germany. Similarly, also, one disease of Europe is the miserable condition of agriculture, which is caused by the crowding of a growing population into a space already become too small, and by the exhaustion of the soil in consequence of increasing competition with larger, newer countries which are thinly populated and produce at little expense.

Since every age derives the scale of its views from the extent of its space, and at the same time is governed by the law of the increase of political areas, we see in the present not merely domains of proportions unknown to the ancients, but even more pronounced tendencies in this direction, which must be counted among the singular features of recent history. Empires which embrace half continents are endeavoring to combine whole con-

tinents with these into a political system. When Cardinal Alberoni, in the third decade of the eighteenth century, proposed a United States of Europe with an European parliament, how visionary the plan appeared then, and how unexpectedly has commerce and civilization in general set the example for it today! For the North American statesman, the American system reaches from Greenland to Cape Horn, includes Cuba, Hawaii, and Samoa, where it comes into conflict with the Australian ideal of the union of all the Pacific islands with Australia.¹ Although in Europe the formation of united empires of Asiatic or American proportions must be recognized as impossible, still a tendency is making itself felt in a milder form towards extensive territorial schemes of a political character, which have evidently been suggested by non-European conditions. The similarity of the economic situation in the two great countries, Russia and the United States, between which the states of western and central Europe seem to be wedged in, has emphasized the admonition to combine.

At the discussion of the new commercial treaties in the Reichstag on the 10th of December, 1891, Caprivi mentioned as a phenomenon of universal history which he considered very significant, the fact of the formation of great empires, their awakened national self-consciousness, and their effort to shut themselves off from others. He said that the stage of history has expanded, that political proportions have grown larger, "and a state that has played the rôle of a great European power can, in a conceivable time, sink to the rank of a small power, as far as its material strength is concerned. If European states wish to maintain their permanent position in the world, they will be compelled to make a close union with one another, so far, at least, as they are adapted to it in other respects." In other

¹ This is particularly advocated by the statesmen of New Zealand. See Sir Julius Vogel's *New Zealand and the South Sea Islands and their relation to the Empire* (London: 1878), and the speech of Seddon, the prime minister of New Zealand, in Hokidada on the 11th of January, 1895 (*The Times*, January 15), in which he enunciates the necessity that the islands of the Pacific Ocean be "peopled by the British race."

words, the ideal of a great political whole, embracing the continent or at least a large part of it, is held up to Europe also. If this great territorial project should triumph over the geographic dismemberment and the ethnographic diversity of Europe, it would be the greatest achievement of which such a project could possibly be capable. Indeed, how differently will this space even then be filled by its varied contents, as compared with Anglo-Saxon Australia and North America, Russian North and Central Asia, or Hispano-Portuguese South America! The European world, both in its peoples and states, will always bear the mark of an historical epoch which dealt with smaller areas than ours; for that reason it will always give the impression of antiquity.

The differences, too, between the northern and southern continents affect the size of their states. The great expanse of land in the north of the northern hemisphere afforded room in Europe, Asia and North America for the largest domains. The two states of continental proportions in the southern hemisphere stand, in point of area, to those of the northern hemisphere in the ratio of 2 : 7. In this fact lies not only the preponderance of political power in the northern hemisphere, but also the increase of competition among its states and peoples, a competition which grows with the numerical strength of both. In the number of their states, also, the northern continents form an overwhelming contrast to the southern. We must make an exception of Africa, since it is not yet politically organized enough to be compared with the others. But, however we may count, the states of the northern continents are still at least twice as numerous as those of the southern.

In every part of the earth, the configuration of the land and the natural irrigation conditioned by it are factors in determining the size of political areas; they operate according to the rule that territorial growth is promoted by all circumstances that accelerated historic activity. Among those peoples whom we are wont to call historic in the true sense of the term and in the hands of whom, from their first appearance, we see ships and

iron, the water has always exercised a quickening and stimulating influence; their states have grown up on islands and coasts, along rivers and lakes. Well articulated coasts, therefore, with numerous bays, peninsulas, islands and river mouths, have been the favored regions where such peoples have built up their states. But since the water acts as a disjunctive factor between the parts of the land, it separates it into naturally defined divisions; of these Greece and the Mediterranean region in general afford the best examples. States have always grown up in these divisions and have been content to fill them out to the boundaries, wherefore such states were quicker to take on their final form and, with their contracted territorial views, developed to maturity more rapidly. The most ancient states of which the history of the Old World speaks all stand under the influence of the spacial conditions of the Mediterranean lands. Peninsulas, islands and river-born oases form the ground on which they arose, and which did not permit any of them to grow beyond medium dimensions. The greatest of them, the Roman Empire, united to Italy the Iberian and Balkan peninsulas, Asia Minor, Mauretania, Syria, Mesopotamia, Egypt, all the islands of the Mediterranean, and Britain beyond; five-sixths of the empire consisted of such naturally defined parts, many of which had before belonged to other states and later again passed over in unaltered size into other hands. The different Mohammedan powers in this region down to the Turkish Empire of our own time have ever anew patched together some of these natural pieces and attained consequently about the same superficial extent. Just as Europe spreads out towards the east in continental proportions, and contracts towards the west to ever narrower areas, similar also is the distribution of its political divisions. The series, England 122,000 square miles, France 207,000 square miles, Germany 210,000 square miles, Austro-Hungary 261,000 square miles, European Russia with Poland and Finland 2,198,000 square miles, shows the increase of political areas towards the east. The same thing is shown by the fact that west of the thirtieth degree east longitude, the meridian of the mouth of the Danube,

lies the Europe of medium and small states, east of it the Europe of single massive Russia.¹

In Asia as in Europe there reappears this contrast between the smaller territories of the articulated south and west sides, and the larger ones of the massive north and east. We find it even between France, confined within its natural boundaries of sea and mountain, and Germany which is endowed with a greater possibility of expansion towards the east, and whose leading powers spread out from the broad east towards the dismembered west. Even the Balkan peninsula shows an increase in the size of its states in the direction of the torso-like mass of the north, just as does India towards the northwest.

Since in every continent, even if it is not copiously articulated, the great unbroken spaces lie in the interior and the naturally divided districts on the margin, the broad interior always forms the source on which the development of the larger domains must draw, thus giving rise to the contrast between the states of the continental body and of the continental limbs. The kingdom of Persia is the first truly great state in the list of the so-called world-empires of antiquity, because it extended farther back into the massive interior of Asia than all earlier states, while these were merely lodged on the edge of the land. The old China reached its continental dimensions only when the inner regions of Thibet and Mongolia joined themselves to it. British North America grew out of Upper and Lower Canada, now Quebec and Ontario, which lie between chains of lakes and seas, and are amply divided up by the St. Lawrence, Ottawa, and Richelieu, and which together are scarcely twice the size of Germany. The strip of country in New England, hardly 15,000 square miles in area, embracing Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut, can be regarded as the cradle of the United States. Virginia, which we might look upon as the nucleus of the southern states, has 42,450 square miles. The area of both these

¹ It is not a matter of chance that the similarity between Greece and the group of European states west of Russia made an impression upon the most eminent recent writer upon Russia. See ANATOLE LEROY-BEAULIEU, *L'Empire des Tsars*, chap. i.

nuclei together stands to that of the whole United States as 1 : 62.

Since historic movements, even in the making of states, almost always advance from the periphery towards the interior just as commerce and civilization do, the marginal countries are therefore necessarily the smaller, older, and earlier matured. That advance is just for this reason a progress to larger from smaller states which first spring up on the periphery and often suddenly expand enormously when they have reached the broad spaces of the interior. The youthful but powerful states and colonies of America and Africa afford numerous examples of this fact. This process takes on astonishing proportions when an insular position enables a large territory to be occupied at the same time from all sides, as Australia, for instance, whose population concentrated on the rim of the continent, whose large cities and prompt, bold enterprise offer the sharpest contrast to Siberia, with its one accessible side. Similar in its effects is a great river system with its thousands of miles of course, which has prepared the country for both dominion and commerce, as the rapid growth of Brazil, the Congo State and the spread of the French on the St. Lawrence and Mississippi abundantly show. These natural conditions are among those which make themselves felt ever again and through all political forms, for the reason that they exert not only a formative but also a conservative influence. Even though the example of powers of continental size in other parts of the world should some day have its effect on Europe, Europe's much articulated west and south will always promote the development of numerous medium and smaller states; just as the great streams and land-forms of eastern America have so far effectuated the construction of political territories on a corresponding scale, in spite of all the disintegrating tendencies at work in the development of states.

The influence exerted by the land upon historic movements continues to operate in less striking ways upon the further evolution of political territories. The peculiar character of the land and vegetation, together with the natural supply of domes-

tic animals, give rise in all parts of the world, but especially in Asia and Africa, to a nomadic life. This, in accordance with its nature, needs and controls broad stretches of country, and hence offers a lively contrast to the contracted life of a sedentary agricultural population and the necessarily scattered hunting folk of the forests. The result is an internal division of the continent into the nomadic region and the region of permanent settlement, in part coinciding with that of the continental body and the continental limbs. Therefore, in the Old World, the regions of active historic movement lay in the great zone of steppes and in the neighboring lands; while on the contrary, in the America and Australia of pre-European times, we find only a tardy progress and a lack of every higher development of governmental organization such as is produced in the Old World by the political stratification of imperious nomads over the masses of industrious agricultural peoples. Therefore, too, great states appear in the steppe and subpolar regions, where a thin population offers no appreciable resistance to subjugation; on the border lands, over into which the movements from the steppes extend, we find medium states, as in Iran, Mesopotamia and in the whole breadth of the Soudan from the Indian to the Atlantic Ocean. Forest regions develop a type such as prevailed in the Negro countries of Africa up to the first invasion of the Europeans and Arabians. There the village states of from four to forty square miles lay like cells in a great magma, within their impenetrable border forests or border prairies, the area of which would equal or even exceed that of the community itself. This condition of things was the rule in all the forest lands of the New World and Oceanica, of ancient Europe and northern Asia, as also of Australia, and it even survived in Farther India nearly up to our time between the greater states which from the coasts and rivers had sent their roots farther back into the land.

FRIEDRICH RATZEL.

UNIVERSITY OF LEIPZIG.